Norman Thomas on the UN Crisis, P. 2

Portrait of An Ambassador Bravely Intent on Self-Deception

"Ambassador Taylor said in the interview [with Mutual Broadcasting System in Saigon] that he believed that this week's air strikes had had 'a very good effect' on the morale of the South Vietnamese."

—New York Times Feb. 14 from Saigon.

"The air strikes have had no noticeable or beneficial effect on public thinking as far as Saigon is concerned. The average Vietnamese in Saigon, if he paid any attention at all to the war, has long felt that it was something that has been taken out of Vietnamese hands anyway. In most countries the threat of national disaster is enough to make rival factions put aside their differences and form a unified front. Things do not work quite that way in Saigon. The greater the threat, the greater the in-fighting and squabbling among generals and civilians alike."

—John Maffre from Saigon, Washington Post same day.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 7 FEBRUARY 22, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Word of Good Advice From Mao Tse-Tung

It has become the fashion among our military, as among the French before their defeat in Algeria, to read Mao Tse-tung. In the Pentagon, and at the Special Warfare school in Ft. Bragg, Mao's manual on guerrilla warfare is regarded as an indispensable handbook for combatting "wars of liberation," almost as if it were a captured secret document, which discloses the plans and tactics of the other side. If the military find Mao so rewarding, we poor civilians may hardly be blamed for taking him seriously, too, and we are glad that *The New Republic* in its issue of Feb. 27* is printing the full text of Edgar Snow's interview with the leader of the Chinese Revolution. The most important word of advice in it is the one most likely to go unheeded.

Why The Trumpet Proved Uncertain

The bit of caution to which we refer comes at a timely moment. The most important casualty of the reprisal raids after Pleiku is the collapse of the hopes that our military, and certain New Frontier intellectuals like W. W. Rostow, had attached to counter-guerrilla warfare. The decision to bomb North Vietnam confessed that after four years of try-out in South Vietnam, their counter-guerrilla theories had failed; the guerrillas were stronger, better armed, enjoyed more popular support and controlled more territory than when our intervention began in 1961. The reprisal bombings marked a shift back to the simplistic theory that "wars of revolution" are operated by remote control from Hanoi, Moscow or Peking. We are now prepared to escalate back to John Foster Dulles's "massive retaliation" if these distant sorcerers do not call off their annoying apprentices. Mao told Snow that he had read Gen. Maxwell Taylor's book, "The Uncertain Trumpet" and some of the U.S. anti-guerrilla manuals which sought to apply Mao's ideas in reverse. Their weakness Mao told Snow, is that they ignore "the decisive political fact that . . . governments cut off from the masses could not win against wars of liberation."

*** A substantial but incomplete text was published by the Washington Post Feb. 14. Abroad it appeared in West Germany's Stern (Feb. 21), the London Sunday Times (Feb. 14) and Le Nouveau Candide in Paris (Feb. 18). The last provided an uncut version. It is a pity it got wider circulation abroad than in the United States where an understanding of the Chinese viewpoint is most needed.**

Voices for Peace

"Bombing North Vietnam in retaliation against attack on U.S. base in South Vietnam constitutes admission of impotence of our policy. Inability to defend American soldiers implies lack of support by South Vietnamese which cannot be corrected by bombing North. Attack on bases in North during Kosygin visit shows poor judgment in use of power, invites directed intervention by North Vietnamese army, China and U.S.S.R. Urge renewed diplomatic probes to explore negotiated settlement with international guarantees."

—Telegram to White House by Dr. Benjamin Spock and Prof. H. Stuart Hughes of SANE.

"America is falling into a Vietcong trap. America should not permit the Vietcong to determine American foreign policy by small guerrilla attacks . . . provoking this nation into military actions which if continued will result in a major escalation that will force first Communist China and then Russia into war. . . . This nation should announce its willingness to seek a peaceful settlement that will result in a neutral Vietnam, guaranteed by the major powers with a UN presence . . . ADA urges . . . world-wide call for a cease-fire. . . ."

—John P. Roche, Americans for Democratic Action.

"The current war in Vietnam is being waged in behalf of a succession of unpopular South Vietnamese dictatorships, not in behalf of freedom."

—Students for A Democratic Society.

Reprisal raids are no substitute for popular support; they merely deepen the revulsion and widen the area of conflict. What would we do with the "Pleiku doctrine" in the Congolese civil war, Dr. Bernard Fall, the author of "The Two Vietnams," asked the other day. Will we bomb Algeria and Egypt for supplying the rebels? Latin America, where we have been training the local military and gendarmerie in "special warfare," may soon provide a reductio ad absurdum of the reprisal doctrine. What if a revolt breaks out in Brazil against the military dictatorship we helped to impose on that huge country? Will we threaten to bomb Havana, Moscow or Peking unless the desperate peasants of the Northeast march back to the plantations with their hungry bellies rumbling?

The failure to grasp Mao's point in South Vietnam does

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Suppose the U.S. Were Taxed for a General Assembly Operation It Opposed?

Norman Thomas Criticizes U.S. Position on UN Dues Crisis

by Norman Thomas*

It is one of life's grim ironies that this year, the 20th anniversary of the creation of the United Nations, was to be celebrated as the year of international cooperation. Instead it may be the year of the breakup or the great weakening of the U.N. The problem, of course, is the failure not only of Russia, but of France, to pay assessments levied by the General Assembly for peace-keeping operations in the Congo. The United States insists that the Charter penalty be invoked by depriving these nations of their votes in the Assembly.

The effect of this might very well be the withdrawal of two nations altogether from the U.N. If they retain membership, it would be at the price of resentment and opposition which would come close to paralyzing the U.N. If the American demand should come to a vote and be defeated by the Assembly, the effect on the U.N. itself and American public opinion would be only somewhat less disastrous. The danger is compounded by the fact that the real government of China, which has never been in the U.N., and the arrogant Sukarno's Indonesia, which has withdrawn from the U.N., are talking about a possible counterinternational organization.

An Immovable Stand

The average American, I suspect, if he pays any attention to this serious issue, will agree with what seems to be our Government's immovable stand. They say or think: "If worse comes to worse, better have nations withdraw from the U.N. rather than to stay in defiance of its basic rules."

This is a decision I seriously question. By the Charter of the U.N., it was the Security Council, in which each of the Big Five had a veto power, which had the right to impose assessments and penalties for nonpayment. This right was transferred to the Assembly owing to the stalemate in the Security Council. An advisory opinion of the sharply divided World Court sustained what we might call the constitutionality of the Assembly's power to assess. The Soviet Union and France for different reasons challenged the Assembly's right to assess nations which refused to support the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations in the Congo. (The success of those operations was scarcely a shining refutation of their opposition. The Tshombe whom the U.N. fought is now the Tshombe whom the U.S. aids by the loan of airplanes.)

Finally, it must be remembered that assessments are levied by an Assembly in which the tiniest nations and those with the least financial strength have each one vote along with the big powers. It is in this situation that the Soviet Union and France refused to pay up. It requires little imagination to predict the storm that would arise in the United States if we were taxed under such conditions for an operation in which we did not believe. I hope I would then argue that we ought to pay but I would also argue that the makeshift provision for levying assessments to support U.N. action is dangerous and must be changed.

I doubt the statesmanship which at this time has brought about so sharp a confrontation as to threaten the existence of the U.N., and I think popular opinion ought even at this late date to encourage our government to go along with the Secretary General of the U.N. in finding some way out. That way cannot be found merely by repeated postponements of the issue, but perhaps the question could be postponed until a definite future date, during which a committee of the Assembly could work out some solution of this issue together with a sounder and more acceptable formula for future assessments. Meanwhile, the Assembly could address itself to the constructive tasks before it.

*A letter to the Washington Post, February 12.

The ADA Deflates LBJ's Budget

"Although nominally held below $100 billion, the Budget actually provides for a modest increase of $6 billion in expenditures, much too modest in an economy which grew by nearly $40 billion last year. This Budget offers no prospect—and no hope—that unemployment in the coming year will be brought close even to the 'interim goal' of 4%. By choosing to cut income taxes, [the Budget] favor[s] more private affluence over urgent social needs. For example, the education system needs $5 billion of Federal aid or more this year. A few urban school systems alone could usefully absorb more than the amount proposed in the Budget [$1.5 billion.] The housing and urban renewal programs are hardly enough to prevent further deterioration of our cities. The Council of Economic Advisors expects a decline in new home building in 1965 instead of the 50% increase needed to start depopulating our slums."

—Statement of ADA National Board, Feb. 7 (abr.).

Proposal to Replace FBI on Civil Rights Provokes Clash With J. Edgar Hoover

The press paid scant attention when the New York Civil Liberties Union Feb. 10 presented Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. with its annual Florina Lasker Award for his devotion to civil rights and liberties. The oversight was an ironic tribute to a man who with little public support has dared over the years to be a constant critic of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. In his acceptance speech, Rauh made public a letter from Hoover responding to the ADA's call for a special civil rights investigative agency to replace the FBI in the South. Hoover said he was "astounded" at the charge that he was "not wholeheartedly determined" to enforce the civil rights laws. He asked for "specific facts" which indicate a failure "to fulfill any assigned duty."

It is the word "assigned" that belies Mr. Hoover's enthusiasm for civil rights. "I cannot help recalling," said Rauh, quoting from a recent article in The Progressive, "that the FBI did not even have a regional office in Mississippi until after the Philadelphia slayings, when Mr. Johnson finally persuaded the FBI chief to remedy that lamentable oversight." Hoover's letter claimed as credits for the FBI the recent solving of a few civil rights slayings and bombings. These were made possible, Rauh replied, only because the agency, after years of prodding from civil rights groups, finally infiltrated the Klan.

When Mr. Hoover opened the FBI office in Mississippi last fall, he referred to the "harsh approach to the Mississippi situation" taken by the authorities in Washington. "It is hardly consistent with a 'wholehearted determination' to enforce the civil rights laws," said Rauh, "to call Attorney General Kennedy's actions in Mississippi 'harsh'."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At The Present Pace Selma's Negroes Will Be Registered In 2,000 Years

LBJ's Promised Deadline of Feb. 15 Passes With No Voting Rights Bill

The Administration has been dragging its heels in drafting new voting rights legislation. In his State of the Union message the President promised to send Congress a bill by February 15, but as we go to press neither the White House nor the Justice Department has made the usual drafting-stage contacts with civil rights leaders in Congress. "I do not feel the sense of urgency on the part of the Department of Justice that we should feel under these circumstances," Senator Javits told the Senate when it confirmed Nicholas Katzenbach as Attorney General. The Senator was referring to the slow pace of Negro registration in the blackbelt counties of the Deep South. In Dallas County, Alabama, whose county seat is Selma, there were 275 Negroes registered in 1956. Nine years later, after the passage of three civil rights acts and the prosecution of more than a half-dozen court cases, there are now 335 Negroes registered—an increase of 60. At this rate it would take more than 2,000 years to register the 15,000 Negroes in the county.

House-to-House Registration

Progress so slow calls for a fresh approach, and a bill introduced last week by freshman Rep. Joseph Resnick (*D., N.Y.*) offers it. The intent of the 1960 Civil Rights Act was to achieve mass registration of Negroes through the appointment of voting referees wherever there was "a pattern or practice" of discrimination. This has not happened for two reasons: Determination of "a pattern or practice" was left in the hands of the Southern courts, and on the three occasions when they have appointed voting referees, few Negroes have sought registration because the law requires that they first try to register with local county registrars. This is a fearful condition to meet, as the boxes on this page indicate. The Resnick bill would eliminate both these obstacles to mass registration. It would transfer the power to determine "a pattern or practice" from the courts to a Federal Voting, Registration and Elections Commission whose six-member bipartisan board would be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. After making such a determination, the Commission could appoint voting registrars with authority to register Negroes on a house-to-house basis, thus by-passing the intimidation and harassment of public county registration.

The Resnick bill would eliminate two additional weaknesses in the 1964 Act. Under it a 6th grade education creates a rebuttable presumption of literacy. Any Negro registered under this provision can be challenged to prove his literacy in lengthy court litigation. The Resnick bill would make a 6th grade education a conclusive presumption of literacy. The 1964 Act also applies only to federal elections; it thus permits greater discrimination in the election of the Jim Clarks and Ross Barnetts who stand most directly in the way of Negro equality. The 1957 and 1960 Acts applied to all elections and the Resnick bill would return to this principle. When the President finally does submit his voting rights legislation, the Resnick bill will serve as a measure of its adequacy.

Inside Selma's Prison Camps

"Mrs. Mary FOSTER (age 46): Tuesday morning we stood in courthouse trying to register and they pushed us with cattle prods and loaded us on the bus. After they arrested us they sent us to Camp Selden and we didn't have heat. Tuesday afternoon they sent us to Camden, [Ala.] camp on a cold bus, no heat in cell, and it was about 100 feet long and 20 feet wide, about 55 women in the cell. This is where Negro prisoners are kept. No fire all winter, no smoking. They had wood floors with holes between planks. They gave us mattresses later and cotton blankets but they didn't give us enough. Women took turns to use blankets and every time one woman turned over she woke up everybody in the cell because there was too many women in there.

"Mrs. Atline TAYLOR: While we were in jail one of the men told the clerk to hit us against the walls, and then they wouldn't give us water. We stayed in jail four days and had no water during this time. We drank water from the commode."

—Testimony taken Feb. 5 by Congressional delegation to Selma. Cong. Rec., Feb. 9, pps. 2382-85.

Selma's Voter Registration As Told By The Negroes In Line

"Rep. CONYERS (D., Mich.): It took you how many years to register to vote?

"Mrs. MOORE (a schoolteacher for 26 years): Twelve.

"Mr. WEST: I am a house painter by trade which I took up by GI bill of rights. I've taken it up for 18 or 19 years. Since participating in the movement, the sheriff and others know me now so I can't get any work.

"Rep. COHELAN (D., Col.): How frequently have you tried [to register]?

"Mr. WEST: Four occasions—the first time in 1963.

"Rep. COHELAN: Why didn't you try to register in 1962?

"Mr. WEST: I was afraid. I had been warned by some older Negro citizens if you try you might be whipped.

"Rep. COHELAN: Why did you get courage in 1963?

"Mr. WEST: I felt more stronger with others with me.

"Mrs. FOSTER: We have to sign a register before we can get a number. If we sign the register the sheriff will tell our boss and the boss will fire employees. If people who receive social security and old age pension checks try to go to mass rallies they cut off their checks.

"Mrs. COOPER: I went down to register to vote, so I was standing in line. I was working at the Dunn Rest Home as a practical nurse. My employer came down and he looked in the line and he saw me. He had his supervisor to call a friend of mine and told her to tell me that I was fired because he saw me in line.

"Mr. GRANT: Last Wednesday I was arrested. I was at the head of the line and there was other fellows behind me and they were arrested and carried to the jailhouse. When we got on the elevator, there were two deputies and they used cattle prods and struck me in the jaw and just everywhere. The man who was behind me—he was 64 years old—they struck him in the temple and the blood flew.

"Rep. COHELAN: Does this frighten you from possibly going through this again?

"Mr. GRANT: It frightened me. I don't think if a person don't be afraid of Sheriff Jim Clark he ain't got good sense. I'm just going anyway, and ask the Lord for strength and courage."

—Testimony taken by Congressional delegation, Feb. 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mao Suggests U.S. Troops Might Stay While Peace Was Negotiated

(Continued from Page One)

not arise from any special stupidity. The trouble is that the situation there has degenerated to the point where any government which was *not* cut off from the masses would respond to their war-weariness. It would open negotiations with the rebels and ask our troops to leave. It has proven so hard to form a new government because it becomes ever harder to find political figures willing to continue the war. In our latest effort to provide some cover for a naked military dictatorship we have had to fall back on men to the right of the late Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem's earlier reputation was based on his refusal to serve as a puppet for the French. The three leading figures in the latest regime in Saigon were all collaborators in the years when Diem preferred an honorable exile in America. The new Prime Minister, Pham Huy Quat, was Minister of National Defense in the Bao Dai regime from 1950 until the French defeat in 1954. This is hardly a testimonial to his prowess or his patriotism. Of the three Vice Premiers, two of them were also Ministers in the Bao Dai regime (see Francois Nivolon's dispatch from Saigon in the Paris *Figaro* Feb. 15). The Dai Viet party to which the new Premier belongs is a party of the far right, expansionist and Fascistic. The day he took office troops fired on demonstrators demanding peace. We can empty every bomb load in the 7th Fleet on North Vietnam but it won't make this regime any more popular in the South. This is the dead-end street of which Mao's words would warn us.

Not At All Bellicose

Snow's interview with Mao is given additional interest by another casualty of the Pleiku reprisal raids. They killed the hope, perceptible in some quarters of the Administration, that the Russians would get us off the hook in South Vietnam without our having to negotiate with the Chinese. In the long run in any case no stable settlement is possible in an area so close to China without taking Peking's wishes into account. It is as if the Chinese and Russians between them were to try and determine the destiny of Mexico without consulting Washington. The U.S. has a Monroe Doctrine; the Russians insist on friendly neighbors; neither can logically deny similar geographical spheres of influence to Peking. But can we negotiate with China? Snow interviewed Mao on January 9, just about the time Washington was full of inspired stories that an attempt to sound out the Chinese had evoked only an arrogant reply: first the U.S. must withdraw its troops and then China would see what could be done. Just where these stories originated is not known but they are hardly borne out by what Mao said to Snow. The Chinese leader was neither bellicose nor dogmatic; he expressed the hope of improved relations with the U.S. He said peace could be negotiated before an American withdrawal or after "or a conference might be held but U.S. troops might stay around Saigon, as in the case of South Korea." The U.S. would be better off *out,* but this at least offers face-saving possibilities (how Oriental we are all becoming!) which would seem to be worth exploring. It's easier to drop bombs than talk peace, but LBJ's favorite Biblical admonition, if we recall correctly, is not "come and let us throw bombs together." *Feb. 16*

Vietcong Collect Tolls on No. 1 Highway

Saigon, Vietnam—Vietcong troops, virtually unhindered by South Vietnamese government operations, have placed a stranglehold on the only overland route from Saigon to the border of Communist North Vietnam. . . . Vietcong toll booths on arterial route 1 . . . have been operating openly and freely since November. . . . These toll booths are believed to have financed the Communist offensive at Binh Gia in December. The operation cost government forces 500 casualties, including a score of Americans. . . . Nearly all cars, buses and trucks are stopped at the toll points and charged $2 to $10. . . . During the recent holiday season, uniformed soldiers without weapons were allowed through the checkpoints but were stripped of their uniforms. Vietcong troops in the area all wear government uniforms. . . . All this has had a devastating effect on the economy of communities all the way up the coast. . . . In the event of a full-scale conventional war with North Vietnam, this situation could become desperate.

—Associated Press in Washington Star, Feb. 11.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/22/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED